

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/685,318

Applicant(s)

FANG ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew D. Matzek

Art Unit

1771

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Matthew D. Matzek.

(3) John Vick Jr..

(2) Daniel McBride.

(4) Sidney Locke.

Date of Interview: 10 July 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: fabric samples with fluorochemical, anti-microbial and electrically conductive coating.

Claim(s) discussed: all discussed.

Identification of prior art discussed: all discussed.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants provided examples of the invention of the latest set of claims that have been coated with fluorochemicals, antimicrobial and electrically conductive coatings. Applicants also discussed the prior art currently available including that which has been applied in prior office actions (Bullock et al.). Applicants provided a movie demonstrating how the use of a fluorochemical release and repellent results in a superior product over only using a repellent. Applicants have clearly demonstrated the benefits of the newly claimed invention and how it distinguishes over the previous applied art .